

MASTER ISSUES LIST - TABLE OF CONTENTS

Subcommittee	Issue #	Status	Page #	Revision Date	Subcommittee	Issue #	Status	Page #	Revision Date
Billing	1	Resolved*		02/02/00	Remittance	31			01/27/00
Billing	2	Resolved*		02/02/00	Policy	32	Resolved*		02/07/01
Billing	3	Resolved*		02/02/00	Metering	33	Resolved*		06/22/00
Billing	4	Resolved*		02/02/00	Policy	34	Pending		01/27/00
Billing	5	Resolved*		02/02/00	Metering	35	Pending		11/29/00
Billing	6	Resolved*		02/02/00	Policy	36	Resolved*		02/07/01
Billing	7	Resolved*		06/22/00	Metering	37	Resolved*		04/27/00
Billing	8	Resolved*		02/24/00	Policy	38			01/27/00
Billing	9	Resolved*		02/24/00	Metering	39	Resolved*		10/11/00
Billing	10	Resolved*		03/08/00	Metering	40	Resolved*		05/18/00
Billing	11	Resolved*		02/02/00	Meter-VEE	41			02/07/01
Billing	12	Resolved*		02/02/00	Remittance	42			02/01/00
Billing	13	Resolved*		02/02/00	Billing	43	Resolved*		02/07/01
Billing	14	Resolved*		02/02/00	Policy	44	Resolved*		05/23/00
Billing	15	Resolved*		02/02/00	Metering	45	Resolved*		05/18/00
Billing	16	Resolved*		04/06/00	Policy	46	Resolved*		04/25/00
Billing	17	Resolved*		02/24/00	Policy	47			01/25/00
Billing	18			03/22/00	Policy	48	Resolved*		02/29/00
Billing	19	Resolved*		10/19/00	DASR	49			01/25/00
Billing	20	Resolved*		02/02/00	DASR	50			01/25/00
Billing	21	Resolved*		10/12/00	DASR	51			01/25/00
Billing	22	Resolved*		03/08/00	Policy	52			01/25/00
Billing	23	Resolved*		04/06/00	Metering	53	Resolved*		10/11/00
Billing	24	Resolved*		10/12/00	Metering	54	Resolved*		10/11/00
Meter-VEE	25			06/22/00	Policy	55			01/25/00
Policy	26			02/01/00	Policy	56	Resolved*		02/07/01
Policy	27	Resolved*		02/29/00	Billing	57			10/26/00
Policy	28	Resolved*		02/07/01	Billing	58	Resolved*		10/12/00
Policy	29	Resolved*		02/07/01	Policy	59			11/01/00
Remittance	30			01/27/00	Billing	60			02/07/01

Subcommittee	Issue #	Status	Page #	Revision Date	Subcommittee	Issue #	Status	Page #	Revision Date
Metering	61	02/07/01	Billing	82 Resolved*	10/12/00
Billing	62 Resolved*	10/26/00	Metering	83	07/20/00
Billing	63 Resolved*	02/07/01	Policy	84	12/04/00
Metering	64 Resolved*	04/13/00	Policy	85	07/20/00
Metering	65 Resolved*	07/20/00	Policy	86 Resolved*	02/07/01
Metering	66 Resolved*	04/27/00	Policy	87	10/04/00
Metering	67 Resolved*	10/11/00	Metering	88 Pending	12/04/00
Metering	68 Resolved*	02/17/00	Policy	89 Resolved*	02/07/01
Policy	69	02/17/00	Metering	90	02/07/01
Policy	70	02/07/01	Metering	91 Resolved*	11/15/00
Metering	71	04/27/00	Policy	92	10/11/00
Billing	72 Resolved*	10/12/00	Policy	93 Resolved*	02/07/01
Policy	73 Resolved*	02/07/01	Metering	94	11/29/00
Policy	74 Pending	04/25/00	Metering	95	11/29/00
DASR	75	03/16/00	Billing	96 Pending	11/16/00
DASR	76	03/16/00			Res.....		
Policy	77 Resolved*	06/22/00	Policy	97	11/01/00
Policy	78 Pending	07/20/00	Policy	98	11/01/00
Metering	79 Resolved*	02/07/01	Policy	99	12/04/00
Policy	80	06/22/00	Policy	100	12/04/00
Policy	81	06/22/00					

***See separate Resolved Issues document**

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
18	For end use customer billing (dual billing situation), ACC Rules are not specific about what the utility and ESPs are obligated to show on their bills. ESP	02/02/00	Billing			<p>02/02/00 In many markets (CA specifically) begin and end meter reads need not be displayed on a bill. In Arizona market, utilities are required to show specific pieces of information but it's unclear if ESPs are required to follow same rules. This could apply to all revenue cycle services.</p> <p>02/24/00 (ACC - Bill Rigsby) reported on ACC Rules, refer to sections R14-2-210B-2 and R14-2-1612. Verbiage states that ALL bills must contain the data elements referred to in these sections. UDCs would be required to show a generation line item on their bill (dual billing) showing a zero amount due. Additionally, ESP would be required to show a CTC charge on their portion of the bill with a zero amount due.</p> <p><u>Action:</u> ESPs/UDCs create a proposal for short term solution which may require filing for waiver to the Rules as a short term solution. All parties to come up with possible long-term changes to the Rules.</p> <p>Issue for MRSPs: Begin and end reads must be printed on bill according to the Rules. So, these must be passed to the billing parties.</p> <p>03/08/00 Should a Rule change be suggested as a short-term solution. It is possible to put this in a combined waiver of issues that need to be changed in the Rules. A long term solution would be actually to change the verbiage.</p> <p><u>Action:</u> ESPs and UDCs should come prepared with their com-</p>	1	Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>pany's position in regards to filing waivers. Group will come up with proposal about how this issue should be resolved.</p> <p>03/14/00 Decision to have a separate waiver filed for this issue (separate from #28,36, & 56).</p> <p>03/22/00 Proposal: Bill party needs to itemize the bill components to allow customer to break down/re-calculate the bill.</p> <p>10/11/00 – October 4, 2000 Rule tweaking package approved – 1612 changed but not 210 B2. 210 B2 DOES need to be chngd. Shirley will let Barbara Keene know and wait for direction from Staff on how to handle the existing waiver.</p>		
25	What specific VEE rules should utilities use on an ongoing basis to verify and bill off of incoming MRSP reads. (PSWG – Billing)	01/26/00	Meter-VEE			<p>01/26/00 Since MRSPs use different algorithms, it's difficult for utilities to determine if MRSPs are performing VEE on an ongoing basis. If utilities use their own VEE systems to verify reads it may cause invalid rejections.</p> <p>02/01/00 What is the utilities responsibility to audit MRSPs? Rules state this certification must take place yearly.</p> <p>04/27/00 A sub/subgroup was formed to review existing VEE rules, develop objectives, changes and proposals (if needed), develop performance measures and monitoring criteria. TEP - Tony Gilloly, APSES, New West Energy - Janie Mollon, C3 Comm, CSC, APS, SRP - Greg Carrel, a representative from the Co-ops (possibly Barry Scott), and possibly First Point. Renee Castillo volunteered to chair this sub/subgroup and will set up a meeting with these participants.</p>		Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						06/22/00 Reassigned from Policy to Metering subcommittee 10/11/00 – This has previously been assigned to VEE		
26	XML versus EDI – What is XML? Should this be considered for a best practice for the Arizona's model? (ACC Staff – Deb Scott and Jerry Smith)	01/25/00	Policy			Issue for Policy subcommittee to investigate. This is not a transport mechanism , it is defined as a data structure. 02/01/00 – Ray Wenzel - Excelergy, offered to coordinate a presentation to PSWG on XML. Evelyn Dryer will address with ACC and possibly get this on a large group agenda.	3	Open
30	Do we need to prioritize transactions by importance due to financial considerations and customer service (for problem resolution and cycle time of EDI 824)?	01/27/00	Remittance	02/08/00		Example, SRP requires acknowledgement both incoming and outgoing within 24 hours. All subcommittees need to define transaction cycle time.		Open
31	Is there a need to standardize dual path or single path when handling the 820? Do we provide a remittance advice directly to ESP and payment directly to bank (dual path)? OR do both documents go directly to bank (single path)?	01/27/00	Remittance	02/08/00		Payments go to bank and details go to provider. Since most banks are currently using VANS, sending both transactions may be costly to sending parties.		Open
34	There is no formalized process to report meter exceptions between UDCs and ESPs. Examples: agreement metering program-	01/27/00	Policy		see Issue 52	(New West Energy - Janie) will provide information regarding this. Proposal: Consensus that a formal communication method (similar to MADEN) will be utilized. Details of what data elements/guidelines will be discussed in both the metering & billing	3	Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
	ming, if MI/MAC forms are not completely filled out, etc. See MADEN for details on exception reasons. (PSWG – Metering)					subcommittees.		
35	At what point does an ESP take responsibility on a meter exchange? And who is responsible for energy consumption during the exchange?	01/27/00	Metering			<p>02/03/00 <u>Action</u>: Utilities to report on their processes 02/16/00.</p> <p>06/21/00 Proposal: Point in time when ESP takes responsibility depends on switch procedures in the separate UDC territories.</p> <p>07/19/00 Discussion centered on calculation of usage, responsibilities of entities in calculation, and how it is reflected on the MIRN form. Group consensus that if meter is our more than 15 minutes, usage will be calculated. Group agreed that except for scheduling and lost registrations, the process is complete. <u>Action</u>: (UDC) determine what they need to calculate usage and how they to incorporate into their procedures for Aug mtg.</p> <p>08/16/00 Discussion regarding who is the responsible party. No clear language in CC&N or Rules that indicate MSP is responsible for calculating Lost Registration. <u>Action Item</u>: APS, APSES and New West Energy research past meter exchanges to determine how long meters are typically out of the socket. Some participants believe amount of unaccounted for energy is so insignificant it may not warrant the calculation. <u>Action Item</u> (due Sept mtg): All participants present their proposed load limit that lost registration would need to be calculated.</p> <p>10/11/00 Refer to UDC Business Rule Comparison document for UDC requirements or state standard</p> <p>11/29/00 Re-opened based on discussion passed from VEE. The</p>		Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						group had agreed on when the ESP or UDC take responsibility for the customer. The group has now discussed a different option. If a non-IDR meter is involved in the exchange, the responsibilities will end/begin at a different interval than if the exchange only involves IDR meters. The reason for this is to ensure that there are no gaps in data and that the customer is not billed twice for the same time. See Business Rule document for examples. Action Item: review proposed changes and report back at next mtng.		
38	Will UDCs allow ESPs to interrogate meters on non-DA customers for load research purposes/ billing option purposes? (PSWG – Metering)	01/27/00	Policy			(New West Energy - Janie) will clarify at 03/13/00 meeting. Details on Issue: Customer is not DA and wants load research data for informational purposes. Example: ESP may be taking multiple customer accounts but not all of them. ESP would like a secondary password to review this information so they can provide information of all sites (even those not going DA) to customer. If there is no IDR meter at site, customer would need to initiate an IDR meter from UDC and pay associated costs.	3	Open
41	Who is responsible for validating that a meter can be read after a MSP has set a new meter? "Day of Install"	01/27/00	Meter-VEE			In CA, it's a requirement from CPUC (Rule 22), the ESP is responsible for ensuring newly installed meter can be read prior to 1 st billing by MRSP or face penalties. 02/03/00 (First Point) This is usually done at the meter install time. 04/27/00 To be addressed in the VEE sub/subgroup. 2/7/01 – the group clarified that this issue involves both the MSP and the MRSP	3	Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
42	Will we require an 824 on all transactions (accepted or take exception to a data element). Do we only want to get an 824 when there's a problem with data? (PSWG - Policy)	02/01/00	Remittance					Open
47	Standardization of Billing Options (ESP and UDC consolidated billing as well as Dual billing) from all UDCs should be implemented immediately to provide customer choice. Include related changes or impacts to other processes or procedures. (APSES)	01/25/00	Policy			<p>A working group of market participants should study the intent of Commission Rules and make a determination that applies to all UDCs. Terms and Conditions for credit, payments and partial payments, and other billing processes should be standardized for all UDCs. During the direct access rulemaking process, an earlier working group discussed whether billing options should be discretionary, but no consistent position was reached. Market participants need to clarify the procedures for consistency among UDCs.</p> <p>In order to develop a viable direct access market, the limitations on customer choice caused by differences in billing procedures among UDCs will be removed. Customer confusion and criticism will be reduced, and ESPs will have flexibility to meet individual customer needs.</p>	2	Open
49	Develop interim business processes that can be implemented manually, and plan mapping for both out-bound (UDC to ESP) and in-bound (ESP to UDC) DASRs for the following communications. Business proc-	01/25/00	DASR			Customers need the flexibility to contact either their ESP or UDC to implement a request, as provided by proposed business processes. The customer's choice and other information can be communicated by e-mail or fax until out-bound/ in-bound DASRs are functional. Customers will not be burdened with having to make numerous phone calls to UDCs and ESPs to implement their service choice. To develop a viable direct access market, the burdens and costs caused by unnecessary switches to/from		Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
	esses should be implemented immediately by each UDC with as much consistency as possible, and EDI mapping can be phased in. Customer Moving: - Notification of direct access customer moving to new address within the same distribution company territory without having to return to bundled service. (APSES)					bundled service will be removed. "Customer choice" will become more of a reality.		
50	New Customer - Same Facility: - A new customer takes over an existing direct access facility, keeps same ESP and meter without returning to bundled service. (APSES)	01/25/00	DASR			see Issue 49, Description, paragraph 1		Open
51	Account Update - Notification of changed account information. UC and PD DASRs appear to be both in/out-bound in the Arizona DASR Handbook (APSES)	01/25/00	DASR			see Issue 49, Description, paragraph 1		Open
52	UDCs and market participants need a clearly-defined communication process for	01/25/00	Policy		see Issue 34	Process should be initiated by any participant to establish communication to solve problem within a defined time frame, if possible, and, if necessary, to maintain communication until root	3	Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
	promptly communicating and resolving problems with data, meters, or bills among ESPs, MSPs, MRSPs, and UDCs (APSES)					<p>cause analysis is complete. Standardized process should be implemented immediately by each participant and automated by all parties as soon as possible.</p> <p>An example of the California "MADEN" process is attached to the original change control document.</p> <p>Process will reduce meter and data errors that cause billing errors and delays in billing and receiving revenue. It will help provide customer satisfaction by reducing billing questions and complaints to both UDCs and ESPs.</p>		
55	UDC fees for Direct Access services (CISR, DASR, metering, meter reading, billing, settlement, etc.) are too high and not consistent between UDCs. (APSES)	01/25/00	Policy			<p>The 3 largest UDCs have proposed varying fees for Direct Access services, such as: meter information, submitting Direct Access Service Requests, meter installations or removals, meter reading services, consolidated and/or dual billing, and settlement billing. These fees are, in some cases, excessively high and do not reflect the true marginal cost of providing these services. Many fees are required by one UDC, but not at all by other UDCs. Even when required by all UDCs for same service, fees are not consistent and vary quite substantially. All the various fees provide an additional barrier to development of a competitive market in Arizona.</p> <p>Proposal To develop a viable market in Arizona, a group consisting of market participants should be tasked with determining which fees should be mandatory, which fees should be discretionary, and which fees should be deferred until the market has developed. This group should also recommend which costs could be recovered as part of base rates and which should be recovered in service fees. Finally, the group should recommend a consistent, cost-based methodology for calculating the costs to</p>	2	Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						be recovered by the UDCs.		
57	How will we handle customer bill disputes that are filed with the ACC for ESP Consolidated Billing. ESP	02/08/00	Billing			<p>(ACC -Bill Rigsby) will check at ACC how often customers file complaints with ACC for bill disputes. How will UDCs handle requirement for the ESP to make us whole?</p> <p><u>Action:</u> (ACC -Bill Rigsby) to check at ACC for proposed changes</p> <p>04/06/00 (ACC -Bill Rigsby) - Believes the ACC will be notifying both ESP and UDC regarding any consumer disputes.</p> <p>Resolution: Billing subcommittee will make a formal recommendation within the report to have ACC notify both ESP and UDC of any formal dispute.</p> <p>10/11/00 Action Item: ACC to define process for October 26th meeting</p> <p>10/26/00 Staff is writing a procedure on how to handle this. May have it at Nov 16th mtng</p> <p>2/07/01 Still waiting on staff to draft procedure – report to be given at 2/21/01</p>	1	Open
59	Need clarification on estimating rules, specifically section 210-A-5C	02/08/00	Policy			<p>Confusion about load profiled customer or customers needing load data. Does this have anything to do with real time pricing?</p> <p>10/12/00 210 A5c The group believe this issue is for 210 A5 c only. Need to determine if it should be a part of our 210 ... waiver</p> <p>Action Item: Shirley will seek clarification with Staff</p> <p>10/26/00 210 A5c - per Barbara keene this is a DA cust that isn't load profiled</p> <p>11/01/00 Assigned to Policy</p>	3	Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
60	According to the Rules, a third party can be back billed up to 12 months. What will the process be for back-billing third parties? (R14-21-E3)	02/08/00	Billing			*Refer to Issue 70	2	Open
61	Who is responsible for tracking the performance of MSP and MRSP's? What is the performance criteria What is process for communicating this information? (PSWG – Billing)	02/08/00	Metering		see Issue 65	<p>06/22/00 Discussion also focused on possible timelines and CUBR has performance standards. Reassigned from Policy to Metering.</p> <p>0720/00 Issue should refer only to MSPs. (TEP) Position on MSP Performance Standards was provided.</p> <p>2/7/01 – the group confirmed that this issue deals with developing performance monitoring /testing criteria for MSPs</p> <p>2/07/01 – established a task team to develop – John Wallace – Chair due date 4-01</p>	3	Open
69	What is the enforceability of recommended processes or rules of non-ACC jurisdictional entities? (PSWG – Metering)	02/17/00	Policy			Where does an ESP file noncompliance complaints for those entities that are not governed by the ACC rulings?	3	Open
70	A utility can back-bill a third party (if party at fault) up to 12 months (R14-212-/e3). This is only specific to the utility. Should Rule be applicable to other participants and not just the utility?	02/22/00	Policy			<p>*Refer to Issue 60</p> <p>Should this Rule be modified to allow all parties providing meter data to be back-billed by recipients of the incorrect data?</p> <p>2/07/01 (moved discussion from issue 60)</p> <p>According to the rules, there are specifics on how utilities bill a 3rd party but there is no specification for any other market participants. (R14-2-210-E3)</p>	3	Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>10/12/00 The group agrees that the definition of Utility in the Rules covers all Certificated Providers and Affected Utilities</p> <p>Action Item: Marta will get confirmation from staff on resolution</p> <p>10/26/00: Staff confirmed that "Utility" in section 201-212 refers to UDCs and certificated Comp Prov.</p> <p>Discussed that each entity should have their own processes – need Comp Prov input</p> <p>Action Item: Marta (staff) will clarify what 1612 b means and verify that MSP/MRSPs are "Utilites"</p> <p>is a duplicate of issue 60</p>		
71	If after receiving an RQ DASR and UDC is planning to disconnect for non-payment or turn off a customer prior to switch, what is process to notify ESP that customer will be disconnected. (PSWG – Billing)	02/24/00	Metering			<p>This particular issue focuses more on how the metering side is handled when this type of issue arises. How to stop the meter exchange process.</p> <p>04/27/00 Will be reviewed when additional business processes are reviewed.</p>	3	Open
75	On incoming DASR – only kWh meter number is required. State DASR handbook does not accommodate a kWh meter and Kvar meters, or other metering combinations. (PSWG – metering)	03/16/00	DASR					Open
76	On DASR – forecasted me-	03/16/00	DASR			In step 3 of Metering Business processes, the pending meter		Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
	ter owner is a required field. Is this appropriate? Should this be taken off of the RQ DASR? (PSWG -Metering)					owner is also required. Meter owner may change from the time the DASR is submitted to the time the meter is exchanged.		
78	There is no language in Rules preventing MSP from contracting directly with customers, how should this issue be addressed?	03/28/00	Policy	08/07/00		<p>System implications – Will MSP have to submit DASR's?</p> <p>Rule change suggestion: Change the definition in Section R14-2-1601 "DASR means a form that contains all necessary billing and metering information to allow customers to switch electric service providers. This form must be submitted to the Utility Distribution Company <i>by the customer's Electric Service Provider load serving entity.</i>"</p> <p>This may force UDCs to create contracts for MSPs. ESP would send DASR but they would not be liable for MSP. Contract would allow UDC to hold MSP liable.</p> <p><u>Action:</u> All participants to assess impacts of MSP contracting directly with customer. Be prepared to discuss your company's position and provide solutions to this issue at the next meeting.</p> <p>05/09/00 (TEP) agrees there is no language in rules that precludes customer contracting directly with MSP. TEP would like to see language added to rules that would not allow a customer to contract directly with an MSP. (APS) identified contractual and system impacts if customer contracts directly with MSP. Systems and processes were developed to transmit DASR directly with ESP only. (APSES) leans towards customer not subcontracting directly with MSP. MSPs should work through ESP so customer doesn't end up with a metering system ESP or MRSP cannot read.</p>	1	Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>06/22/00 To be reviewed by ACC staff. Is this within the purview of PSWG? <u>Action:</u> (due 06/30) Participants to submit position papers per 06/22/00 minutes.</p> <p>07/04/00 (Marv Buck) provided an overview of how other states are handling. Participants (NWE, APS, TEP, Phaser, SRP, APSES) presented their positions in a consolidated document to the PSWG.</p> <p>07/20/00 Steve Olea presented ACC staff position: Electric Competition rules allow MSPs to contract directly with customers; operating procedures need to be developed. Issue will include only MSPs at this time, but MRSPs will be kept on radar screen. <u>Action:</u> Participants may submit issue sheets, including 1) impact of issue on business processes and 2) any past practices in markets that provide insight to edryer@tucsonelectric.com by 08/07/00.</p>		
80	What are the security and encryption standards that will be used in transmitting data (Barry Scott).	05/09/00	Policy			06/22/00 Priority set at 1.	1	Open
81	What information is provided on a CISR from each UDC and is that information consistent (Jim Woner –APSES)	05/09/00	DASR			06/22/00 Priority set at 3.	3	Open
83	When customer switches from DA back to SO or ESP to ESP and the MRSP has	06/22/00	Metering		see Issue 65, 59, 60, 70,	06/22/00 <u>Action:</u> Each entity to provide their solutions on how to handle this issue in July subcommittee meeting.	1	Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
	not provided meter read data (or estimated reads) for previous months, what should the UDC/ESP do to retrieve missing data? How can the final bill get trued-up? Should the UDC/ESP be allowed to estimate the final bill?				83, 84	07/20/00 (APS) discussed MRSP Performance Standards at the PSWG mtg. (TEP) Position on MRSP Performance Standards was provided. 08/16/00 Billing Subgroup is currently addressing.		
84	Is the bill that is issued when a customer switches considered a "final" bill?	07/19/00	Billing			9/28/00 Staff confirmed that the when a customer switches providers or disconnect service, it is a "Final Bill". 10/12/00 The group agreed that R14-2-210 A5b should be addressed/modified with the next Rule Tweaking Package - Waiver not needed at this time. Will raise at Policy Group Nov 1 10/26/00 this issue covers all of section 5 not just 5b, will raise at Nov 1 Policy mtng		Open
85	Granfathering totalization of meters.	07/20/00	Policy			issue statement unclear		Open
86 cont						12/4/00 – TEP advised that they have 2 tariffs in conflict with R14 1606 C6. SSVEC may have tariffs in conflict. SRP & APS advised they do not have tariffs in conflict. John Wallace will confirm with the Coops. Action Item: Staff to advise on next steps 2/07/01 – prior resolution: Barbara Keene reported that that ACC will handle on a case by case basis		
87	Should a customer (w/out a UDC contract) be required to secure a new provider w/in	10/04/00	Policy			APS' Schedule #1 section 3.5 has this requirement		Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
	60 days after returning to Standard Offer?							
89	Need a mechanism for costing assoc. metering equip	08/00/00	Policy			Paul Taylor raised the issue of looking at maximum costs for metering equip. Wants to ensure that equipment is sold at fair costs		Open
90	What is the UDC process for external devices		Metering			<p>TEP – External devices can be used with an approved meter with KYZ pulse output. Meter must have visual display of kWh and kW. See TEP handout or Business Rule document from additional info</p> <p>APS – External devices are allowed with approved meters. Continued discussion on how the device will be powered. APS to report back on position</p> <p>SRP – External devices are allowed with approved meters.</p> <p>10/11/00 – APS POSITION STILL UNDER REVIEW</p> <p>11/15/00 External device positions have been updated for APS, CUC and AZ Coops – See Business Rule doc attached to the Nov 15 minutes</p> <p>11/29/00 All company positions were updated at 11-15 meeting – will update status at next metering meeting</p> <p>2/07/01 – will resolve with metering business rules</p>	1	Open
92	How do UDCs handle a customer requested disconnect for UDC or ESP? How do we differentiate between a DA customer and Bundled customer? What type of training?	9/13/00				<p>10/11/00 Issue raised by Janie Mollon (NEW) in the metering group – referred to Policy to assign to the appropriate group. – TEP, APS, SRP, AZ Cooperatives</p> <p>Refer the customer to the ESP for DASR submittal to the UDC. Once the DASR is received the UDC will initiate the orders to disconnect the service.</p>		Open
94	What is the timeframe for UDC to exchange the meters to return direct access	10/25/00	Metering			<p>ESPs want a required timeframe for UDCs to complete the exchange and ret cust to Bundled serv.</p> <p>10/11/00 New West Energy proposed a 10 working day from</p>	2	Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
	customers to bundled service					the DASR requirement.. UDCs to review and comment at next meeting 10/25/00 The group discussed the issue and agreed to table it until Staff confirms if Standard Offer cust can own meters or not. 11/29/00 – UDC processes have been documented in the Business Rule document. Will address this issue once the market is more established.		
95	What is the start read for a new meter sets	10/25/00	Metering			10/25/00 Do meter set have to start at zero? Action item: participants will come back to November mtng with positions 11/29-00 – SRP, TEP, APS require DA meters to be set at zero and CUC & SSVEC does not require reads at zero. Pending feedback form other Cooperatives	1	Open
97	D-Star is requiring 10 minute intervals for imbalance settlement,	11/1/00	Policy			11/1/00 FERC is requiring this by 12-15-01 – Unsure on when the PSWG should start addressing this. CA went to 10-min intervals on 8-1-00 and are doing in line interpolation.		Open
98	Develop transfer mech from UDC to participating ESP for Environmental Surcharge	11/1/00	Policy			11/01/00 Surcharge is supposed to take effect 1-1-01		Open
99	The use of Electronic Signatures for DA transactions (House Bill 2069)	11/15/00	Policy			11/15/00 The metering group requires a signature for the exch of the EPA form. Since metering is not the only group that this may apply to, it is passed to Policy and will be raised on 12-4-00.		Open
100	What process can be developed to facilitate a customer installing an IDR meter and equipment before DA that allows a customer to move to DA and back with the	12/4/00	Policy			12/4/00 Action Item: Participants to draft position papers identifying options and send to Evelyn Dryer by January 24, 2000. Evelyn will consolidate position papers and send out prior to the February 7, 2000 meeting.	1	Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
	same equipment.							
101	MRSP performance monitoring and certification					2/07/01 Task team was established, chaired by Janie Mollon due date 4/04/01		Open
102	Modify 867 to meet VEE rules					07/20/00 Missing intervals and zero intervals referred to next VEE session.		Open
103	Day of Removal					Need to develop a procedure to ensure that when a meter is removed that all data is captured. Develop who is responsible for posting up to what time		Open
104	Develop VEE rules for Non IDR							Open
105	MSP/MRSPs should be allowed to subcontract for services to qualified personnel, without having to make them employees of the company, as long as the certificated MSP/MRSP is still responsible for the work they perform.					2/07/01 Copied from issue 56 to separate the two issues.		Open
106	Develop a document showing all agreed upon billing business rules				See issue 96			Open
107	Develop a document showing all agreed upon Metering business rules					2/07/01 Task team was established, chaired by Stacy Aguayo due date 3/07/01		Open